



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,951	10/24/2000	Eugenie Charriere	004900-188	8720

21839 7590 04/16/2003

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

8

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/673,951	10/24/2000	Charriere	004900-188

EXAMINER	
Sergent	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711	8

DATE MAILED:

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

The reply filed on January 30, 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicants have failed to fully address the issues set forth within paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office action. With respect to paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claim 53), despite applicants' response, "true trimer" has not been clarified. With respect to paragraph 2, despite applicants' response, no explanation has been provided for producing biurets by means of trimerization reactions. With respect to paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claim 25), the issue concerning (cyclo)trimerization has not been addressed. With respect to paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claims 26 and 28), despite applicants' response, "may" remains in the claims, the issue concerning the definition of "n" has not been addressed, and the ambiguity concerning "derived isocyanate function" has not been adequately addressed. The examiner recommends that the terms, such as carbamate, urea, etc., within the specification be utilized. With respect to paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claim 40), despite applicants' response, the issue concerning the language, "the desired degree of conversion", has not been adequately addressed; applicants' response does not clarify the language. With respect to paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claim 45), the issue concerning the claimed weight percent being essentially meaningless has not been adequately addressed. With respect to paragraph 3 (rejection pertaining to claims 46-53), while "low viscosity" has been defined, the term, "reduced-viscosity", has not been defined. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).**

Additionally, the following issues have been noted within applicants' amendment of January 30, 2003: Within claim 26 (at the top of page 3 of the response), the structure and text are out of sequence. Within the definition of B within claim 26, it is unclear what constitutes "other" hetero atoms. Within line 1 of claims 34-36, the language, "according of", has been inserted into the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent

April 14, 2003

  
**RABON SERGENT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**